DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 344 HE 025 240

AUTHOR Amos, Arthur K., Jr.
TITLE The Davis Academic Environment-1990. A Report of Student Opinions.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Davis. Office of Student Affairs Research and Information.
PUB DATE Jun 91
NOTE 41p.; For related documents, see HE 025 239-246.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Aptitude; College Curriculum; College Faculty; College Instruction; College Libraries; College Outcomes Assessment; *College Students; *Educational Environment; Educational Facilities; *Educational Quality; Ethnic Groups; Higher Education; School Schedules; *State Universities; *Student Attitudes; Student Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Student Opinion Survey; *University of California Davis

ABSTRACT

A study was done to examine student opinion of the academic environment at the University of California Davis campus in Spring 1990 as a follow up to a similar study conducted in 1987. The study used the Student Opinion Survey and mailed it to a stratified random sample of 1,649 students. Of the surveys sent, 57.7 percent were returned. The following findings were reported: (1) students reported higher scores than those reported by their national peers in eight of 19 areas; (2) in 13 areas students reported lower levels of satisfaction than the 1987 students; (3) students reported higher levels of satisfaction than their national peers with major course content and instruction but lower satisfaction with program flexibility; (4) satisfaction with courses and classes decreased due to increased student numbers; (5) students remained very satisfied with the faculty at Davis; (6) with the exception of the academic calendar, the 1990 respondents reported levels of satisfaction close to those reported by national peers and 1987 respondents; (7) students reported declining satisfaction with classroom and laboratory facilities, and (8) students reported less satisfaction in 1990 with their preparation for future occupations and with Davis in general than did respondents in 1987. Included are appendixes containing a copy of the survey and one table. (Author/JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341344

THE DAVIS ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT—1990

A Report of Student Opinions

Arthur K. Amos, Jr.

Student Affairs Research and Information

University of California, Davis

HE 025 240

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

January 1991

(Reprinted: June 1991)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

UC Davis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE DAVIS ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT—1990
A REPORT OF STUDENT OPINIONS

Executive Summary

This study examines the perceptions of undergraduates enrolled at UC Davis in Spring 1990. It follows up a similar study of students enrolled in Spring 1987. The study uses data collected with a survey mailed to a stratified random sample of 1649 students. Of the surveys sent, 57.7% were returned.

This study identifies the following major findings:

- UC Davis students report higher scores than those reported by their national peers in eight of the nineteen areas herein examined.
- In thirteen areas, the 1990 respondents report lower levels of satisfaction than did the 1987 respondents. Areas that reflect the greatest impact of the growth of the undergraduate population are especially likely to show declines in satisfaction.
- UC Davis undergraduates respond positively about their major programs. They report higher levels of satisfaction than their national peers with major course content and with instruction in the major but a lower level with program flexibility. Satisfaction with major course content and program flexibility has declined since 1987 but has gone up with major course instruction.
- Satisfaction with courses and classes seems to have been hit hardest by the increases in student numbers. Satisfaction reported with course variety, course availability, and size of classes all declined. Only with course variety does the satisfaction level reported by Davis undergraduates exceed that of their national peers.
- Undergraduates remain very satisfied with faculty at UC Davis. They report higher levels of satisfaction than their national peers with both the availability of instructors and with the attitudes of faculty toward students. Indeed, the level of satisfaction with both is higher than that reported by respondents to the 1987 survey.
- With the exception of satisfaction with the academic calendar, the 1990 respondents report levels of satisfaction close to those reported by their national peers and respondents to the 1987 survey. The substantial decline in satisfaction with the academic calendar since 1987 may be largely attributed to the timing and duration of the 1990 Spring break.
- UC Davis undergraduates report declining satisfaction with classroom facilities and laboratory facilities, two areas that reflect early pressure from increases in the undergraduate population. They also report lower satisfaction with tutorial services but slightly higher levels with study areas, library facilities and computer services.
- UC Davis undergraduates report less satisfaction in 1990 with their preparation for future occupations and with UC Davis in general than did respondents in 1987. Their satisfaction with preparation for future occupations is also lower than that reported by their national peers. Even with these declines, UC Davis undergraduates report greater satisfaction with their college in general than do their national peers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

ACADEMIC MAJOR PROGRAMS 3
- Major Course Content 3
- Instruction in Major 4
- Program Flexibility 6

COURSES AND CLASSES 8
- Variety of Courses Offered 8
- Course Availability 9
- Size of Classes 10

FACULTY 12
- Availability of Instructors 12
- Faculty Attitudes 12

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES 14
- Testing and Grading 14
- Academic Probation and Suspension 15
- Academic Calendar 16

ACADEMIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES 17
- Classroom Facilities 17
- Laboratory Facilities 17
- Study Areas 18
- Library Facilities 18
- Computer Services 19
- Tutorial Services 20

EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES 21
- Preparation for Future Occupation 21
- College in General 21

CONCLUSIONS 23

APPENDIX A 25

APPENDIX B 33

METHODOLOGY ..... *(available on request)*

INTRODUCTION

In Spring 1990 Student Affairs Research and Information surveyed students at UC Davis to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the campus' support services. By answering a questionnaire developed by the American College Testing Program (ACT) and a set of campus-specific questions, respondents provided their opinions about a number of campus programs and services, and evaluated various aspects of the college environment.

The 1990 survey was the second use of the ACT protocol, the Student Opinion Survey (see Appendix A for a copy); it was also used in Spring 1987. Repeated use of the same instrument permits us to examine changes in student opinions over time as well as to compare opinions of Davis undergraduates with those of other colleges and universities having enrollments greater than 10,000 students around the country. Divided into five sections, the instrument asks demographic questions; questions about the use of and satisfaction with twenty-three programs and services typically found on a university campus; questions about satisfaction with forty-two aspects of the university environment; questions about problems and advising at UC Davis; and for specific comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the academic advising experience at UC Davis. Despite the specificity of the open-ended question, a majority of those making comments chose to comment on a broad range of topics.

We constructed a sample of 1649 students having valid California addresses, disproportionately stratified by ethnicity into four groups or strata: 190 Asians, 536 Blacks, 523 Chicanos, and 400 of all other ethnicities. On April 6, 1990, we mailed survey packets to the local addresses of our sample population. We followed up by sending postcards to the entire sample and second packets to those who had not already returned their questionnaires from the first packet. In order to get a sufficient number of responses to analyze, we sent a third packet to those Black students who had not returned either the first or second questionnaire.

We accepted completed questionnaires through June 19, at which time all usable survey forms were shipped to ACT for processing.

Of 1649 students in the sample, 951 or 57.7% completed and returned usable questionnaires. Response rates varied among different subgroups of respondents. Women were more likely than men to return a completed questionnaire (62% *versus* 52%). More Asians returned surveys (67%) than did Whites and all others (65%), Chicanos (57%), or Blacks (48%). Freshmen were more likely to respond (63%) than sophomores (56%), juniors (56%) or seniors (53%). Students from the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences were slightly more likely to respond to the survey than those from Engineering or Letters and Science (58% *versus* 57%).

The following analysis uses mathematical means to compare the 1990 Davis responses with the 1987 Davis responses and with national norms (derived from a

sample of colleges and universities with populations larger that 10,000 surveyed between January 1, 1987 and April 30, 1990). Except where noted, the scales range from 1, Very Dissatisfied, to 5, Very Satisfied. The Davis means have been computed using weighted values to compensate for the effects of the sampling scheme. The four ethnic groups will be labeled as Asian, Black, Chicano and, because the remainder are predominantly White, White.[1]

Throughout the course of this report, a significance level of .05 is used. When we say that the mean scores of two groups of respondents are statistically different, we mean that there is at least a 95% chance that the groups from which the respondents come also differ. Finally, the comparisons made in this report are, for reasons of simplicity, bivariate. Thus, for example, when we point to significant difference between men and women on a particular variable, we should say that without considering the effects of other variables—ethnicity, perhaps, or major—they differ.

This report discusses variables related to the classroom environment and other aspects of academic life at Davis except academic advising, which will be discussed separately in a forthcoming report. The body of the report includes summary statistics; complete tables can be found in Appendix B[2]. The Davis responses were analyzed by ethnicity, sex, class level, and college. For the most part, individual discussions are limited to those dimensions within which can be found statistically significant differences. If, for example, the difference between the mean scores of men and women is not statistically significant, that difference will generally not be discussed. Occasionally, however, a difference too small to hypothesize a similar difference in the entire undergraduate population will still be large enough to warrant some comment.

[1]An Appendix further discussing methodology is available upon request from Student Affairs Research and Information.

[2]The complete Appendix B is available on request from Student Affairs Research and Information. A sample table is included in this document.

ACADEMIC MAJOR PROGRAMS

The ACT instrument includes three questions that deal with attitudes about the major program. Students are asked how satisfied they are with the "course content in your major field," with "instruction in your major field," and with the "flexibility to design your own program of study." On two of these, "course content" and "flexibility," respondents report slightly lower levels of satisfaction than did the undergraduates in the 1987 survey. In neither case, however, does the difference exceed two-tenths of a rating point. In all but the last case, Davis respondents report higher levels of satisfaction than do the respondents in the national norms for colleges with enrollments over 10,000.

MAJOR COURSE CONTENT

Like the 1987 respondents, the respondents to the 1990 survey report relatively high levels of satisfaction with their course content. Although respondents to the current survey report slightly lower levels of satisfaction with major course content (3.89 *versus* 3.93), the difference is so slight that we cannot say that there has been a decline in the satisfaction of the entire undergraduate population. Similarly, the difference between Davis respondents and those in the national norms (3.89 *versus* 3.86) is so small as to lead us to say that both groups of students share similar attitudes about satisfaction with major course content.

Black students report the lowest levels of satisfaction (3.77) while White respondents report the highest (3.91). The differences among the four ethnic groups are, however, so slight that we are unable to say confidently that similar differences can be found in the population from which the sample was drawn *($F=1.28$, $p=.28$)*.

Respondents from the three colleges report different levels of satisfaction with major course content but the differences are not such that we may be confident that they reflect similar differences among all Davis undergraduates *($F=0.69$, $p=.50$)*. Engineering students report the lowest level of satisfaction (3.80 *versus* 3.90 for Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and for Letters and Science).

Just as in 1987, some respondents comment disparagingly on the perceived emphasis on theory and research found in many majors. Those who make such comments may be equating college education and vocational preparation. In any case, they serve as reminders of the continuing importance of conveying to potential students the institution's actual emphasis in order to forestall as much as possible the dissatisfaction that follows thwarted expectations.

UCD is an excellent University, and I feel privileged to be a student here! As I have indicated, I am a Rhetoric & Communications / Political Science major. I'm finding a lack of practical skills teaching—everything is much more theory oriented than it has to be. In Rhetoric & Communications there are a few classes on media analysis, but whenever I want to take them they

are not offered that quarter—it gets frustrating.

I enjoy attending school at UC Davis. The campus is diverse and active. The Engineering Dept. is "pretty" well organized. However, I do wish there were more practical classes offered. Perhaps more Independent study could be recommended to undergraduates.

The attitude underlying this concern, that college level courses should contain practical content, could contribute to the lower level of satisfaction of Engineering respondents. On the other hand, Engineering students report the highest level of satisfaction with preparation for future occupation.

Instruction in Major

As is the case with major course content, respondents to the 1990 survey report a slightly greater level of satisfaction with instruction in the major than their national peers (3.94 *versus* 3.83). They also report a slightly greater level of satisfaction than respondents to the 1987 survey (3.94 *versus* 3.86). In both cases, however, the difference is too slight to support a claim for differences among the populations from which the samples were drawn.

Engineering respondents report less satisfaction with instruction in the major (3.80) than do respondents in Letters and Science (3.94) and in Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (4.00). Although the differences are large, particularly the one between Engineers and students in Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, they are not large enough we may be confident that all Engineering undergraduates are less satisfied with instruction in their majors than are other undergraduates *(F=2.23, p=.11)*. Several of the comments, especially those dealing with language problems in the classroom, suggest possible reasons for this reported lower level of satisfaction. As these comments make clear, the complaint applies to teaching assistants and faculty:

Many of the Teaching Assistants (and some faculty) have such difficult accents to understand I have to strain to listen to them. I believe that people should be hired who can speak effectively since teaching involves so much communication.

and

Overall, I am satisfied with UC Davis, but there is one aspect that I dislike. This aspect is the number of teachers and TA's, particularly in Mathematics and the sciences, who cannot fully speak English. The three Mathematics teachers I've had at Davis all had foreign accents that made understanding them more difficult. At times, I became very annoyed and irritated. I agree that to a certain degree English is not that important in Mathematics; but it is still necessary. In many situations, a person who could speak regular English would have made explaining concepts that much more clear. I hope UC Davis alleviates this problem.

Students also call into question the ability to teach of some unnamed faculty. From the student viewpoint, the problem seems to be an emphasis on research over teaching, a leitmotif that appears in connection with other questions in the survey:

This university needs to make vast improvements in obtaining instructors who can Teach, not just Research. With the tremendous resources and reputation UC Davis has, UCD could very well be one of the finest teaching universities on the West Coast, if not the nation. However, until the university shifts its focus from research or even treats education of the students as equal in importance with research, this university will continue to vastly underachieve in the field of education in general."

Lastly, some students comment on the relative superiority of some majors on the campus.

However, I feel Davis needs improvement in certain academic programs. Davis is strong in its Nutrition, Botany, other science programs. The University has been known to be strong in its science program. but it lacks strength in the major field of Sociology. I've had my experiences with good teaching professors. But I've also had my share with bad ones. I hear that Sociology majors have increased, but the Sociology-related programs (e.g., internships, student employment, career opportunities) are lacking. Most of the time, I had to find jobs that seem Sociology-related. UC Davis needs to develop a stronger program in Sociology—in its teaching of it and the resources available.

Although the previous comment alludes specifically to sociology, another student notices that programs in the liberal arts get slighted on the campus.

The only comment is that the Liberal Arts majors at UCD is not that good compared with the Natural Science majors or other universities and so it would be better if they can develop the liberal arts majors!!

Many concerns expressed by these respondents echo the comments of the 1987 respondents. The issues that they raise are of importance to them, and the campus's success in addressing them will affect directly its reputation as an undergraduate teaching institution.

The differences among the four ethnic groups are large enough to make us confident that similar differences may be found among Davis undergraduates *(F=3.41, p.=02)*. In particular, Blacks report significantly less satisfaction with instruction in the major than do White respondents (3.43 *versus* 3.63). This difference may stem from a relative absence of Black instructors. In this view, here expressed by a Black student, the low number of Black instructors represents a continuation of a serious injustice.

None of my professors are African American. Not many administrators are people of color. Comparing the state's population of Latinos, African Americans and Asians to the ratio of faculty and administrators, the numbers are disproportional. New policies need to be implemented to change the current injustices, since all citizens of California pay for this university.

The notion that teaching skills are specific to specific ethnic groups is surely flawed. But the argument that the ethnic mix of instructional staff speaks to the intent and ability of the institution to achieve affirmative action goals is tenable. In these terms, the ethnic mix can affect the quality of a student's academic experience. The responses to this survey suggests that this may indeed be true of Black students.

PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY

In 1990, respondents report slightly lower levels of satisfaction with program flexibility than either the 1987 respondents (3.39 *versus* 3.60) or those in the national norms (3.39 *versus* 3.47). The differences between the 1990 levels and those of both the national norms (.08) and the 1987 respondents (.21) are large enough to say that similar differences can be found between the populations from which the samples were drawn. The difference between the current population and the national norms is not large enough to be considered substantive. The difference between 1990 and 1987 is another matter; it represents a real decline in satisfaction, one with which the campus should be concerned.

What, one may ask, has caused this decline? Clear answers to this question do not leap to the fore. General Education requirements were phased in, beginning with the class entering in Fall 1984 and did not fully affect any class prior to the one entering in Fall 1986. Perhaps one side effect of the General Education requirement is a reduction in satisfaction with the flexibility to design one's own program of study. If so, the problem is a complex one, involving both curricular matters and scheduling matters. One student in Electrical Engineering puts the matter this way:

> *Through my experiences at this college so far, the curriculum of Electrical Engineering major is so narrow that I have no flexibility to explore. Also, it is ridiculously impossible to get into a GE course. The first two years are usually used to complete the GE requirements, but it's so difficult to get into the courses that I can't take most of my GE until my senior year.*

Some students, this freshman English major among them, find it difficult to wind their way among the requirements:

> *I'm still confused about Breadth Requirements for my major (English). College of L&S should have a list of courses that would satisfy this requirement, as the other colleges do. I have no idea what to take and neither did the people in the English Dept. (Rm 222 Sproul Hall). My major outline tells me to take 52 units for "area requirements." Is this my breadth requirement list? How do I know which classes fall under "Humanities & Fine Arts," "Social Sciences," or "Natural Sciences"? It is extremely confusing.*

Some of the unhappiness with program flexibility, such as there is, results from the rigidity implicit in programs that are packed with requirements. This comment from an Engineering student speaks to this problem:

> *Engineering students don't have enough latitude in the curriculum; the classes aren't offered often enough during the year; and too many units are required.*

The College of Engineering is not alone, however, as this student from Biological Sciences makes clear:

> *Since the first day of school here I have been encouraged to be diverse. Realizing the importance of a well-rounded education I had always planned on taking some classes from a variety of different areas. Yet as a Biological Sciences major this is IMPOSSIBLE! The Requirements for my major are so strict that I am being FORCED to get a narrow and close-*

minded education. WHY CAN'T I TRY TO PRACTICE WHAT YOU PREACH ABOUT DIVERSITY? My advisor told me that to graduate with a Biological Sciences degree and spend one year in Spain with Education Abroad Program, I would be here for 6 years. This is because almost all EAP programs are for Humanity majors. Can't Biological Sciences students also be diverse and travel with EAP?

These students speak to one of the consequences of advances in their fields. Progress in an academic field brings with it the temptation to layer additional course requirements to a major within the field. Frequently the additions are made without corresponding deletions so that the major program demands an ever increasing share of students' academic careers. It is, of course, in recognition of this pressure to specialize that breadth requirements are created. But these requirements bring with them their own set of problems, not the least of which is an understanding of the requirements. Furthermore, when the requirements can be satisfied only by a relatively small cadre of classes, simply getting into the necessary courses can be a problem.

Getting Classes (GE & Major) as a sophomore (and sometimes as junior) is extremely difficult. I am a sophomore, and the past two quarters I've had to take fewer units just because I couldn't get classes I need. This is very frustrating and is something students shouldn't have to deal with to this degree. More resources need to be made available for more readers and TAs so professors can offer bigger or more classes.

The possible causes for the decline in satisfaction with flexibility to design one's academic program could also lower satisfaction with course availability. As will be discussed below, this has in fact occurred.

Engineering respondents report lower levels of satisfaction with program flexibility than students in the other two colleges (2.96 *versus* 3.45 for Letters and Science and for Agricultural and Environmental Sciences). These differences are large enough to infer with confidence that Engineering undergraduates are less satisfied with this characteristic than other undergraduates at UC Davis *($F=9.70$, $p<.01$)*.

Although the variation among the four ethnic groups is not large enough for us to be confident that similar differences can be found in the population *($F=2.14$, $p=.09$)*, the differences among the respondents are suggestive. Chicanos report the highest levels of satisfaction with this aspect of their education (3.54) and Asians, the lowest (3.25). Blacks (3.43) and Whites (3.42) differ only slightly.

But Asians make up a disproportionate share of the Engineering student body. It is, therefore, difficult to sort out how much of these differences are due to ethnic differences and how much to differences in college.

COURSES AND CLASSES

VARIETY OF COURSES OFFERED

Although 1990 respondents report lower levels of satisfaction with the variety of courses offered at UC Davis than did 1987 respondents (3.97 *versus* 4.09), the current group remains significantly more satisfied than their national peers (3.97 *versus* 3.81). Although we may confidently infer that the populations from which the samples were drawn differ in the same directions as the samples, neither difference is substantial.

One source of dissatisfaction may be the absence of certain programs on the campus. In particular, many students bemoan the absence of "Business" courses:

> *I think there should be more Business Classes (Accounting). In order to compete with the big schools we need to be well rounded in all areas of education (just like the state schools). A place where your major is found and you can take more than 2 classes of it.*

Others express concern about the differences between the offerings of UC Davis and those of the other campuses in the system.

> *There are some courses here that are not accepted by other schools such as UC Berkeley. We also don't offer certain courses that other UC schools offer. We do not offer a lower division Latin American History course.*

The satisfaction with course variety, however, is not distributed evenly through all ethnic groups. Blacks (3.75) are significantly less satisfied than other ethnic groups *(F=3.93, p=.01)*. One does not have to look far for one possible source of discontent among Black students—the absence of an ethnic studies requirement.

> *Racial Harmony: there should be more University-funded programs to promote interracial understanding. Courses like Afro-American Studies 123 (Racial Ethnicity) should be a two-part class offered every quarter to allow a greater opportunity for student involvement. I also think that there should be some sort of requirement for ethnic studies being part of GE.*

> *A suggestion I would make to this University, is to have an Ethnic Studies requirement. Many students are ignorant to other cultures, and this ignorance is a factor in racial and cultural conflicts. I believe that in having an Ethnic Studies requirement, there will be a greater racial harmony.*

Respondents from the College of Engineering and from Letters and Science report lower levels of satisfaction with the variety of course offerings (3.94 *versus* 4.06 for Agricultural and Environmental Sciences). The differences, however, are not large enough to permit us to reject the hypothesis that students from the three colleges are alike in their satisfaction with the variety of courses offered *(F=1.66, p.=.20)*.

Course Availability

As mentioned above in the discussion of program flexibility, satisfaction with the availability of courses has declined substantially from that reported by the 1987 respondents (2.71 *versus* 3.28). The level of satisfaction has declined to a level below that in the national norms (2.71 *versus* 2.77). While this latter difference is too small to assert with confidence that the populations of UC Davis and their national counterparts differ on this measure, we can be 95% sure that Davis students are between .45 and .69 of a rating point less satisfied with course availability in 1990 than they were in 1987.

In 1988, while examining the 1987 survey results, I wrote

> *Course availability and class size . . . are related issues; both are likely to be substantially affected by campus growth, particularly in the short run. If the number of courses and the times that they are offered cannot keep up with the increases in demand caused by growth, satisfaction with this aspect of the academic environment will decline.*

That prophecy required little prescience; the pressures of increased enrollment were already quite obvious in 1987. The decline in satisfaction reported by the 1990 respondents may represent the fulfillment of that prophecy. In any case, the decline in satisfaction with course availability is substantial and represents a real change in the population.

The following two student comments on this issue provide some insight on the relationship of course availability to increases in time to degree:

> *UCD has a good selection of courses within major; however, upper division courses are not offered often enough. Some required classes are only offered one quarter a year, every other year. This makes it difficult to plan an early graduation date.*

and

> *I am dissatisfied with scheduling. Major classes are offered once a year. The student has little flexibility. If you cannot fit a class in or are unable to finish, you have lost an entire year. Also, some quarters it is necessary to enroll in at least 16 major units and others that only 8 units are offered. I would like a more balanced work load.*

Respondents tend to blame an inadequate registration system for the unavailability of courses (1990: 3.24; 1987: 3.80; National Norms: 3.21), as with these comments:

> *Although the educational factors are far above average, registration procedures hinder attempting to receive this education. I feel very strongly that the UC Davis registration system needs re-working. I am dissatisfied with the fact that I never receive the classes I request, and never receive them even after in-person enrollment.*

and

The only negative thing I have to say about UC Davis is that the availability of the courses I want at times I can take them is very poor. Most of the time, I never get the classes I want for a particular quarter, so I have to take other classes that I do not want just so that I will have all my units. This is wasting my time and money, so I really think that this problem should be taken into consideration and should be solved because the enrollment system really stinks! (Please don't take this in a bad way, but I am just pointing out the weaknesses of this university.)

While it is possible that a new registration system will lessen the problem, it is also likely that a solution to the problem will prove more elusive than that.

The four ethnic groups vary in their satisfaction with course availability with Chicanos reporting the highest level of satisfaction (2.92); Asians, the lowest (2.66); and Blacks (2.75) and Whites (2.71) in the middle. The differences, however, are not large enough to infer a similar distribution in the whole undergraduate population *(F=2.21, p=.09)*.

Respondents in Agricultural and Environmental Sciences report the highest level of satisfaction with the availability of courses (2.85) and those in Letters and Science, the least (2.64). The differences, however, are not large enough to infer that students from the three colleges also differ in the population *(F=2.84, p=.06)*.

Size of Classes

Satisfaction with class size has declined less precipitously than satisfaction with class availability; it is now 3.39 *versus* 3.52 in 1987. Nevertheless, Davis students report levels of satisfaction that are considerably below those reported in the national norms (3.39 *versus* 3.84). These differences are sufficiently large for us to be confident that similar differences pertain to the populations from which the samples were drawn. We may be 95% sure that the satisfaction of 1990 Davis undergraduates is between .02 and .24 of a rating point lower than that of 1987 Davis undergraduates, a difference that borders on the substantial. We have the same confidence that Davis undergraduates are between .39 and .52 less satisfied than their national counterparts—a very substantial difference.

UC Davis respondents are particularly vociferous about class size, as these comments make clear:

As an undergraduate seeking a Liberal Arts education, I am bothered by class sizes. 300 students in an upper division Philosophy class is ridiculous. A crowded classroom is detrimental to the learning process.

and

Classes are too big, meaning that too many students are enrolled for the personal attention one needs.

and

My biggest complaint is the size of the classes. They are far too large. I can understand having large GE classes, but my upper division English classes often have up to 100 people in them.

Considering these complaints, one may be surprised that the level of satisfaction is not even lower than it is, that it has not declined further from the 1987 levels. But in 1987 the campus was already experiencing some of the effect of overcrowding. Classes were already filled to capacity; thus, continued growth had more of an effect on course availability. These pressures are distributed equally; all four ethnic groups are equally unhappy *(F=.63, p=.60)*. Similarly, satisfaction with class size is not associated with college *(F=.86, p=.42)*.

FACULTY

Availability of Instructors

Satisfaction with the out-of-class availability of faculty reported by respondents to the 1990 survey is up ever so slightly from that reported by the 1987 respondents (3.85 *versus* 3.79). Similarly, Davis respondents report slightly greater satisfaction with faculty availability than is reported in the national norms (3.85 *versus* 3.75). In neither case, however, is the difference large enough for us to claim similar differences in the source populations confidently.

Despite the generally high level of satisfaction, students register unhappiness about the distance of faculty. The kind of discontent with faculty expressed in the following two comments is likely to have an effect on satisfaction with advising even if it does not lower satisfaction with availability of faculty.

> *I also feel that instructors should hold more office hours. Again at community college, my instructors held five hours per week as opposed to one to two hours per week here.*

and

> *There is a definite need for more faculty advisors and greater availability of all advisors in general. The faculty is just too distant from the students—I haven't found one professor who seems truly interested in contacting the students after class on a personal level. The office hours of most of the faculty members are far too limited in terms of availability—it's frustrating!*

The four ethnic groups do not differ substantially from one another on this measure *(F=1.71, p=.16)*. Respondents from Agricultural and Environmental Sciences report the highest level of satisfaction with the availability of their instructors (3.99); those from Engineering, the lowest (3.75). Respondents from Letters and Science more resemble those from Engineering than they do those from Agricultural and Environmental Sciences in satisfaction with faculty availability. The variation in response among those from the three colleges is sufficiently large to infer similar differences among all undergraduates by college *(F=5.34, p<.01)*.

Faculty Attitudes

Respondents to the 1990 survey report slightly higher levels of satisfaction with faculty attitudes than did the 1987 respondents (3.83 *versus* 3.79); indeed, the level is slightly above that reported by their national peers (3.83 *versus* 3.81). Again the differences are so small as not to be statistically significant; we cannot reject the hypotheses that Davis undergraduates have the same level of satisfaction in 1990 that they had in 1987 and that they have the same level of satisfaction as that of their

national counterparts.

Although the level of satisfaction is relatively high, the comments suggest some underlying dissatisfaction. Several respondents opined that they, as students, were less important to their instructors than the instructors' other duties:

> *A significant attitude I have noticed amongst faculty is a disillusionment of their jobs due to issues of salary, teaching loads, committee responsibilities, and research demands.*

and

> *I feel that research is stressed too much at UCD and that too often professors do not take the active role which they should in their classes.*

Others objected to what they perceive as the arrogance of faculty. A case in point is this comment from an otherwise happy student.

> *UC Davis is a good university, but it fails in the area of instructor availability and concern about students. Some students, such as myself, do not and have not received Financial Aid, and thus must put ourselves through school. This fact of working and attending school full time should be a concern of all the instructors. Student should be treated individually by the professors, and the teachers should not try to "browbeat" students into any power-oriented domination classroom scene. This problem is often persistent in upper division Political Science classes, in which the often "cocky" instructors are unwavering in their opinions.*

Blacks are substantially less satisfied than other students with the attitudes of faculty (3.54 *versus* 3.74 for Chicanos, 3.84 for Asians, and 3.85 for Whites; $F=5.74$, $p<.01$). Some of the differences between Black and students of other ethnicities may be rooted in the heightened sensitivity among Black students of the underrepresentation in the faculty of Black professors.

Similarly, satisfaction with faculty attitudes is associated with college ($F=9.75$, $p<.01$). Respondents from Agricultural and Environmental Sciences report the highest level of satisfaction with faculty attitudes (4.04); those from Letters and Science, the lowest (3.74). Respondents in Engineering split the difference (3.84).

TESTING AND GRADING

The mean satisfaction reported in 1990 (3.61) is very slightly higher than that reported by 1987 respondents (3.56), a difference so slight as to preclude confident inference of a similar difference between the two undergraduate populations. The satisfaction reported by 1990 respondents is slightly lower than that reported in the national norms (3.69). We may be 95% sure that the true difference between Davis undergraduates and their national peers falls between .03 and .13 rating points, an insubstantial difference.

Although comments from the 1990 respondents did not include complaints about grading on a curve, they did include resentment about the general harshness of grading at UC Davis.

> *I think the grading system is too tough at Davis, and many incoming students have a hard time to adapt to it.*

and

> *I think the grading is too hard at Davis. The professors aren't concerned enough with trying to help students.*

Two comments get right to the point, albeit from different ends of the grading spectrum.

> *I am frustrated with professors who give a low percentage of A's.*

and

> *Also a Pass [grade] for a Pass/No Pass [course] should be given for a D- or better.*

Concerns expressed about testing and grading also include complaints about multiple-choice testing:

> *Testing should be essay instead of all multiple choice.*

and

> *Multiple choice examinations should be limited because they don't represent a reflection of the student's knowledge.*

Blacks report lower levels of satisfaction with grading and testing policies than do other groups (3.43 *versus* 3.57 for Asians, 3.60 for Chicanos, and 3.63 for Whites).

The difference is large enough to generalize back to the whole undergraduate population *(F=2.84, p=.04)*.

Academic Probation and Suspension

1990 and 1987 respondents report similar levels of satisfaction with policies concerning academic probation and suspension (3.49 and 3.51). The difference between Davis respondents and national respondents, while large enough to assert a similar difference in the populations confidently, is so small as to be insubstantial.

One comment, however, includes an example which, if prevalent, may suggest a problem with current policies:

> *I have known people to be on and off of Academic Probation for three years. They have been on Academic Probation for more than the stated time to recover. It is too easy to appeal in order to stay enrolled. These people are taking up class space and make it difficult for people like myself to enroll in classes. Stricter action should be taken against people on Academic Probation."*

This student is not alone in complaining about the policies:

> *I have marked "very dissatisfied" in regard to items 19 [Satisfaction with academic probation and suspension policies] and 32 [Satisfaction with the academic calendar of this college] of Section III, College Environment. The academic probation and suspension policies seem to me to be biased and unjust. I have personally seen students "kiss up" enough to stay enrolled (as long as they did not receive Financial Aid). But those less fortunate, who do receive Financial Aid, I have seen given less and even no second chance.*

Lastly, one student comments on the need for making policies and regulations clear to those affected by them.

> *It seems as though students do not find out about particular Rules and/or Regulations until they have already broken them. For example, going on Academic Probation if you do not have twelve units a quarter. I understand that it is all written in the [General] Catalog but the exact regulations and requirements are so deeply hidden within the rest of the text that it takes a student five years to figure out how to find the information needed—unless of course you do not meet the requirement in time in which case a letter is sent to your house telling you of your wrong doing. A separate listing of requirements for each college would be helpful for student to understand what is expected of them.*

Respondents from the four ethnic groups do not differ significantly among themselves as to satisfaction with academic probation and suspension policies *(F=.278, p=.85)*. There is a similar lack of differentiation among respondents from the three colleges *(F=1.48, p=.23)*.

Academic Calendar

Satisfaction with the academic calendar declined precipitously between 1987 and 1990 (2.96 *versus* 3.48). The reason for the decline, however, appears to rest on one specific characteristic of the 1989-90 academic calendar: a particularly short Spring break.

> *It was extremely stupid to start the Spring Quarter on a Friday. No other UC schools did this and in doing this, some students did not even receive a full week after finals. Classes should begin on Mondays between quarters!*

and

> *Question #32: I feel that the school calendar is unfair to those that live far away from home, especially in the area where no Easter Holiday is given because Easter is a time for families to be together, not considering the religious significance this holiday has. EXTREMELY DISSATISFIED.*

Other aspects of the calendar also received comment. Two respondents offered up an early start for fall quarter in exchange for a longer Christmas break.

> *Academic Calendar—class begins too late, approximately the last week of September, allowing a two week break for Christmas. Why not start a week earlier, allowing a reasonable three week break?*

The quarter system itself is a source of some dissatisfaction. One respondent commented at some length about its limitations.

> *All I would like to say is that being on a Quarter System is quite difficult to put in all the time and effort into so many classes in such a short period of time. It is very stressful on us students and we are forced to rush through many important concepts and we can't really achieve anything if we don't have enough time to get to understand them. We don't really care about the classes themselves, what we care about is just being able to pass. And, this is not good at all!*

And another student compared the quarter system with the semester system at a community college.

> *I strongly feel that the University should return from the Quarter System to semesters. I previously attended a community college and feel that the education I received on a semester system was far more effective than UCD's present system.*

Differences among the responses from the four ethnic groups are small enough that we cannot reject the hypothesis that they do not differ in their satisfaction with the academic calendar *(F=2.06, p=.15)*. A similar situation holds when we look at the responses by college *(F=1.61, p=.20)*.

ACADEMIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Classroom Facilities

Satisfaction with classroom facilities declined substantially between 1987 (3.71) and 1990 (3.40); the difference is large enough that we can say with confidence that the true difference between the 1987 and 1990 undergraduate populations falls between .21 and .39 rating points. In addition, the satisfaction reported by Davis respondents has fallen below the national norms (3.64). This difference, while smaller than that between the 1990 and 1987 respondents, is large enough to infer that the true difference between the populations falls between .18 and .29 rating points, a difference of some substance.

The reason for the decline in satisfaction cannot be deduced from the comments, which center on environmental issues. The following is representative.

> *In reference to the classroom facilities, I think that they are all very adequate, except that some, such as Young and Olson, are not well ventilated.*

It is reasonable to conclude that the decline comes as one effect of the increased pressure on classroom facilities caused by growth in the undergraduate population. Thus, as rooms become more crowded and less accessible, they become less hospitable. Whatever the problems, they are felt equally by all four ethnic groups *($F=.89$, $p=.45$)* and by students from all three colleges *($F=1.01$, $p=.37$)*.

Laboratory Facilities

The 1990 respondents report a lower level of satisfaction with laboratory facilities than did the 1987 respondents (3.53 *versus* 3.71). The reason for the decline, which represents a true decline in the populations of between .08 and .28, is not absolutely clear. It is possible, even probable, that the decline in satisfaction is, like the decline in satisfaction with classroom facilities, a side effect of campus growth. With laboratories, however, we may add that increased use has had the effect of reducing the time available for maintenance and that the facilities are showing the effects of age and wear. One student, at least, comments to this effect:

> *Maintenance and availability of lab equipment is a problem in the Chemistry Dept.*

Whatever the reason for the decline in satisfaction with laboratories, it drops Davis below the national norms (3.59) and the difference between Davis respondents and those in the norms is sufficiently large to be confident that a similar small difference can be found between the populations.

Study Areas

Davis respondents report slightly higher levels of satisfaction with study areas than do those in the norms (3.68 *versus* 3.61). This level of satisfaction is slightly higher than that reported in 1987 (3.57) but the difference between the 1987 respondents and those to the current survey is not sufficient to confidently infer a similar difference among all undergraduates in 1987 and 1990.

Respondents in the College of Engineering report higher levels of satisfaction with study areas than do respondents from the other two colleges (3.83 *versus* 3.78 for Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and 3.60 for Letters and Science). The differences are large enough that we may be confident that similar differences exist in the undergraduate population at UC Davis *(F=4.62, p=.01)*.

Of the four class levels, freshmen report the highest levels of satisfaction with study areas (4.00 *versus* 3.77 for sophomores, 3.43 for juniors, and 3.55 for seniors). As with the differences among the respondents from the three colleges, these differences are sufficient that we may infer similar differences in the population *(F=17.65, p<.01)*. However, the reasons for these differences are a little more obvious; freshmen are more likely to have available the study areas in residence halls than their more advanced peers.

Library Facilities

Most Davis respondents report having used the library (98.8%). And they report relatively high levels of satisfaction, 4.09 in 1990 *versus* 4.10 in 1987. The difference in the satisfaction reported by respondents of the two Davis surveys is not sufficient to infer that there has been any change in the satisfaction of the undergraduate population. Davis respondents do report slightly higher levels of satisfaction than do those in the norms (3.98). The difference between the Davis respondents and the national group, while small, is large enough that we may be 95% confident that the true difference between the populations falls between .06 and .17 rating points.

Despite the high level of satisfaction with the library, its expansion came in for some criticism:

> *I do like the fact that UCD is trying to expand the image of the University through new construction. However, the new Shields Library seems to be inadequately designed. A lot of wasted space exists and there is not enough seating. The set up also makes it very noisy.*

and

> *The new library is a waste. It is not only an echo chamber but there is less study space than the old. There is also a lot of wasted space and it's unfair for only the staff to have use of the 4th floor snack room and balcony. There is no 24 hour study hall and too many carrels (cubbies); not enough large tables. The benches out front are unnecessary, money could have been used more prudently.*

One student chose to comment on the library's holdings:

The only problem I believe is quite frustrating is the resources in the Library. Many of the ethnic books, such as Chicano literature are not available at Davis. The college needs to expand its reading selection in the Library, especially political science and ethnic books.

The differences among the ethnic groups are so small as to render rejection of the hypothesis of homogeneity untenable; we cannot say with confidence that differences in satisfaction with the library are associated with differences in ethnicity *(F=.92, p=.43)*. The same holds for differences among the three colleges *(F=2.68, p=.07)*. Having said that, however, we should attend to the fact that respondents from the College of Engineering report substantially greater satisfaction with library facilities than do respondents from the other two colleges (4.27 *versus* 4.08 for Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and 4.07 for Letters and Science). This difference, coupled with the significant difference in satisfaction by college with study areas, points to a possible impact of the effects of remodeling Shields Library. After all, Engineering students are particularly likely to use the Physical Sciences library while students from the other colleges not in mathematics or the physical sciences are more likely to be dependent upon Shields. Once the remodeling has been completed, we may hope for increases in satisfaction by students from the other colleges.

Computer Services

Not only has computer usage gone up from 50.6% of the 1987 respondents to 65.6% of the 1990 respondents, but satisfaction with the facilities among respondents has risen as well (3.91 *versus* 3.88). The difference between the results of the 1987 survey and the current one is not large enough for us to be confident that a similar difference would be found in the populations. Davis respondents also report higher levels of satisfaction than the national norms (3.91 *versus* 3.73); this is large enough that we may be 95% confident that the difference in satisfaction in the populations falls between .10 and .25, with Davis students more satisfied than their national counterparts.

Increased reliance on computing has its risks. As the campus grows and as the percentage of students using computers increases, the pressure on the computing facilities will also increase. One student comment anticipates this problem very well.

Basically, I am satisfied with this university and have very few complaints about it. The complaint is in the relatively small and few Computer lab centers and its virtual unavailability towards the end of the quarter due to students wanting to use them.

The differences in satisfaction with computer facilities reported by respondents from the three colleges (4.01 for Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, 3.79 for Engineering, and 3.89 for Letters and Science) are not large enough to infer similar differences among all UC Davis undergraduates *(F=1.90, p=.15)*.

Tutorial Services

The percent of students reporting having used tutoring is down from 35.8% in the 1987 survey to 29.2%, and the mean satisfaction is down slightly as well, from 3.94 to 3.89. The difference in satisfaction is not large enough, however, to infer a similar difference in the whole populations. Blacks and Chicanos report higher levels of satisfaction with tutoring than do Asians and Whites (4.01 and 4.13 *versus* 3.71 and 3.92). The differences among the ethnic groups of respondents are large enough that we may be 95% confident that similar differences may be found among the whole undergraduate population *(F=3.28, p=.02)*.

EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

Preparation for Future Occupation

Satisfaction with preparation for future occupations reported by respondents has declined somewhat from 1987 (3.37 *versus* 3.49) and is substantially below that reported in the norms (3.59). In both cases the difference is large enough to be confident that there are differences between the populations from which the samples were drawn. The inferred difference between 1987 and 1990 undergraduates falls between .015 and .229; this is not substantial. On the other hand, the difference between 1990 undergraduates and their national counterparts is substantial, falling between .16 and .28. The four ethnic groups do not vary significantly in the satisfaction they report with preparation for future occupations *(F=1.66, p=.17)*.

One student commenting on how UC Davis prepares undergraduates for their vocations feels a lack in practical preparation. This is another side of UC Davis's perceived focus on theory.

> *Finally, I feel that the University does not prepare me to face the real world. I feel that I know a lot about books but way little in practical experiences needed in a job. Internship is still not enough!*

College in General

The overall evaluation of the campus by Davis undergraduates is quite positive. Although they report significantly higher levels of satisfaction with college in general than do their national peers (4.12 *versus* 3.93), respondents to the current survey report lower levels of satisfaction than did the 1987 respondents (4.12 *versus* 4.20). The difference between the satisfaction reported by respondents to the two Davis surveys is not large enough to allow a confident inference that the two undergraduate populations differ.

The four ethnic groups, however, do not report equal levels of satisfaction with the college in general *(F=9.92, p<.01)*. Black students appear substantially less satisfied (3.83 *versus* 3.98 for Asians, 4.01 for Chicanos, and 4.18 for Whites). At the core of this Black dissatisfaction is a perception that the institution, faculty and students are racist.

> *As an African-American, the overall atmosphere of UCD is Racist. . . . The fact there is an insufficient number of Black faculty, advisors, and administrators, Black students here on this campus are suffering and the retention rate is thus decreasing. From my 5 year experience here at Davis, I would strongly recommend more focus and emphasis on minority sensitive-awareness issues and start representing Afro-American students as well as other students of color by hiring more Black faculty.*

One Chicano student put her perspective on the matter:

This has been a very good college yet the administration needs to handle racial awareness more gracefully than it has been. Educators know about the problems yet those who have the power to change things seem to be blind to the situation.

Respondents from the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences report higher levels of satisfaction with college in general than do respondents from the other two colleges (4.24 *versus* 4.01 for Engineering and 4.09 for Letters and Science). The differences are large enough to expect similar differences among all Davis undergraduates *(F=6.01, p<.01)*.

The comments of the respondents reinforce the message given by the numbers; despite reservations, they feel positive about the institution. Reservations about their experiences include a sense that the quality of the institution is declining:

UC Davis is an excellent ACADEMIC school which is beginning to lag. There needs to be a broadening of courses and professors attitudes—we are here to learn from them, not to play 2nd fiddle to their research projects.

Students worry about the impact of growth:

The University population is growing too large for the facilities offered to handle. Classrooms are overcrowding and instructor-student relations are declining. This is a problem present at all colleges (public ones) and is badly in need of attention.

But the bottom line is that many Davis students, especially those who stay, continue to speak highly of the institution.

Having been a student at UC Davis for 5 years, I feel that this campus is a great place to go to college. In addition to a very challenging academic program, UC Davis also has a wide variety of social and athletic programs for students. I personally feel that a strong point of UC Davis is the people. Students, faculty and campus staff are all very friendly, and the people of the town of Davis are also friendly. The way of life in Davis is very relaxed. All in all, UC Davis is a great campus and the town of Davis is a wonderful place to live.

CONCLUSIONS

Just as was the case in 1987, undergraduates generally feel positive about the UC Davis academic environment. In 1987, however, UC Davis enjoyed a relatively clear advantage over schools included in the national norms; undergraduate respondents from UC Davis reported higher levels of satisfaction than did their peers elsewhere on most of the measures discussed in this study. This is no longer the case. The 1990 respondents are generally close to their national peers, sometimes reporting slightly greater satisfaction and sometimes, slightly less.

The loss of ground to the national norms may be attributed mostly to a decline in satisfaction of UC Davis undergraduates rather than to an increase in satisfaction elsewhere. The decline in satisfaction comes in those areas most affected by the growth of the undergraduate population. The institution has not been able to keep up with the increased demand of larger numbers of students. This trend, if allowed to continue, bodes ill for the campus.

The course of true growth ne'er did run smooth and there is no reason to believe that the campus cannot recapture some of its former glory. By paying attention to the effects growth has on reported satisfaction, the academic administration can make the necessary adjustments, including increasing the numbers of sections of courses in high demand, especially those required of undergraduates, and the times that they are offered. We cannot be sanguine about the speed with which the campus can respond because some of these changes in the faculty and others require changes in the physical plant.

Some of the changes are on the way already; new buildings are at least in the planning stage and some are underway. Older facilities are being renovated. The student records system is evolving and a new registration system cannot be far behind. In short, the campus is already taking some of the steps required to meet the needs of Davis undergraduates and we may remain cautiously optimistic about the future.

Appendix A

The ACT Questionnaire

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

STUDENT AFFAIRS RESEARCH AND INFORMATION

DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616

April 30; 1990

Dear Student:

Recently Vice Chancellor Dutton wrote to you asking your opinions about academic advising and other student services offered at UC Davis. If you have already returned the survey form, thank you for your cooperation.

If you have not yet returned the questionnaire, perhaps you could take 30 minutes right now to complete it and mail it to us. If you did not receive a questionnaire or have misplaced it, call 752-2000 for a replacement.

Your participation is important. You were selected to represent many of your fellow students. Your opinions will help campus leaders improve or expand services. Better services benefit everyone--future students, faculty and staff, and you as well.

Thank you for your time and help.

Cordially,

W. David Haggerty

W. David Haggerty
Director

Enclosures

STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

DIRECTIONS: The information you supply on this questionnaire will be kept completely confidential. However, if any item requests information that you do not wish to provide, please feel free to omit it. Your Social Security number is requested for research purposes only and will not be listed on any report.

Please use a soft (No. 1 or 2) lead pencil to fill in the oval indicating your response. DO NOT use a ball-point pen, nylon-tip or felt-tip pen, fountain pen, marker, or colored pencil. Some items may not be applicable to you or to this college. If this is the case, skip the item or mark the "Does Not Apply" option. If you wish to change your response to an item, erase your first mark completely and then blacken the correct oval. Select only ONE response to each item.

2522

PAGE 1

USE A SOFT LEAD PENCIL ONLY

SECTION I—BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Begin by writing your Social Security number in the large boxes at the top of Block A. Then, in the column below each box, blacken the appropriate oval. Complete the remaining blocks by blackening the single most appropriate oval in each case.

A SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER (Identification Number)

___ – ___ – ____

B AGE

- 18 or Under
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23 to 25
- 26 to 29
- 30 to 39
- 40 to 61
- 62 or Over

C RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP

- Afro-American or Black
- Native American (Indian, Alaskan, Hawaiian)
- Caucasian or White
- Mexican-American, Mexican Origin
- Asian American, Oriental, Pacific Islander
- Puerto Rican, Cuban, Other Latino or Hispanic
- Other
- I prefer not to respond

D INDICATE YOUR CLASS LEVEL AT THIS COLLEGE

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Graduate or Professional Student
- Special Student
- Other/Unclassified
- Does Not Apply to This College

E FOR WHAT PURPOSE DID YOU ENTER THIS COLLEGE? (Select Only One)

- No Definite Purpose in Mind
- To Take a Few Job-Related Courses
- To Take a Few Courses for Self-Improvement
- To Take Courses Necessary for Transferring to Another College
- To Obtain or Maintain a Certification
- To Complete a Vocational/Technical Program
- To Obtain an Associate Degree
- To Obtain a Bachelor's Degree
- To Obtain a Master's Degree
- To Obtain a Doctorate or a Professional Degree

F SEX

- Male
- Female

G MARITAL STATUS

- Unmarried (Including Single, Divorced, and Widowed)
- Married
- Separated
- Prefer Not to Respond

H INDICATE THE NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK YOU ARE CURRENTLY EMPLOYED

- 0 or Only Occasional Jobs
- 1 to 10
- 11 to 20
- 21 to 30
- 31 to 40
- Over 40

I WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT ENROLLMENT STATUS AT THIS COLLEGE?

- Full-Time Student
- Part-Time Student

J WHAT TYPE OF TUITION DO YOU PAY AT THIS COLLEGE?

- In-State Tuition
- Out-of-State Tuition
- Does Not Apply to This College

K WHAT IS YOUR RESIDENCE CLASSIFICATION AT THIS COLLEGE?

- In-State Student
- Out-of-State Student
- International Student (Not U.S. Citizen)

L WHAT TYPE OF SCHOOL DID YOU ATTEND JUST PRIOR TO ENTERING THIS COLLEGE?

- High School
- Vocational/Technical School
- 2-Year College
- 4-Year College or University
- Graduate/Professional College
- Other

M INDICATE YOUR CURRENT COLLEGE RESIDENCE

- College Residence Hall
- Fraternity or Sorority House
- College Married Student Housing
- Off-Campus Room or Apartment
- Home of Parents or Relatives
- Own Home
- Other

N DO YOU RECEIVE ANY TYPE OF FEDERAL, STATE, OR COLLEGE-SPONSORED STUDENT FINANCIAL AID? (Scholarships, Grants, Work-Study, etc.)

- Yes
- No

USING THE LIST OF COLLEGE MAJORS AND OCCUPATIONAL CHOICES INCLUDED WITH THIS QUESTIONNAIRE, PLEASE SELECT THE THREE-DIGIT CODES FOR YOUR COLLEGE MAJOR AND YOUR OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE. WRITE THESE CODES IN THE BOXES AT THE TOP OF BLOCKS O AND P, AND BLACKEN THE APPROPRIATE OVAL IN THE COLUMN BELOW EACH BOX. (IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE MAJOR, SELECT THE ONE CODE THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM.)

O INDICATE YOUR COLLEGE MAJOR

P INDICATE YOUR OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE

30

31

© 1990 by The American College Testing Program. All rights reserved.

DO NOT TEAR OR STAPLE THIS FORM

SECTION II—COLLEGE SERVICES

For each service (or program) listed below, indicate whether or not you have used the service, and if you have used the service, your level of satisfaction with the service. If a service is not offered at this college, mark "Not Available at This College" and leave part B blank. If a service is offered but you have not used it, mark "I Have Not Used This Service" and also leave part B blank. Indicate your level of satisfaction (part B) only if you HAVE used the service.

PART A: USAGE				COMPLETE PART B ONLY IF YOU HAVE USED THE SERVICE →	PART B: LEVEL OF SATISFACTION				
NOT AVAILABLE AT THIS COLLEGE	I HAVE NOT USED THIS SERVICE	I HAVE USED THIS SERVICE		COLLEGE SERVICE OR PROGRAM	VERY SATISFIED	SATISFIED	NEUTRAL	DISSATISFIED	VERY DISSATISFIED
0	0	0	1.	Academic advising services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	2.	Personal counseling services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	3.	Career planning services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	4.	Job placement services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	5.	Recreational and intramural programs and services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	6.	Library facilities and services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	7.	Student health services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	8.	Student health insurance program	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	9.	College-sponsored tutorial services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	10.	Financial aid services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	11.	Student employment services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	12.	Residence hall services and programs	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	13.	Food services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	14.	College-sponsored social activities	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	15.	Cultural programs	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	16.	College orientation program	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	17.	Credit-by-examination program (PEP, CLEP, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	18.	Honors programs	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	19.	Computer services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	20.	College mass transit services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	21.	Parking facilities and services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	22.	Veterans services	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	23.	Day care services	0	0	0	0	0

32

33

MAKE NO STRAY MARKS ON THIS FORM

SECTION III—COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT

Please blacken the oval indicating your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of this college. If any item is not applicable to you or to this college, fill in the oval in the "Does Not Apply" column and proceed to the next item. Please respond to each item by choosing only one of the six alternatives.

		LEVEL OF SATISFACTION					
		DOES NOT APPLY	VERY SATISFIED	SATISFIED	NEUTRAL	DISSATISFIED	VERY DISSATISFIED
ACADEMIC	1. Testing/grading system	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2. Course content in your major field	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3. Instruction in your major field	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4. Out-of-class availability of your instructors	0	0	0	0	0	0
	5. Attitude of the faculty toward students	0	0	0	0	0	0
	6. Variety of courses offered by this college	0	0	0	0	0	0
	7. Class size relative to the type of course	0	0	0	0	0	0
	8. Flexibility to design your own program of study	0	0	0	0	0	0
	9. Availability of your advisor	0	0	0	0	0	0
	10. Value of the information provided by your advisor	0	0	0	0	0	0
	11. Preparation you are receiving for your future occupation	0	0	0	0	0	0
ADMISSIONS	12. General admissions procedures	0	0	0	0	0	0
	13. Availability of financial aid information prior to enrolling	0	0	0	0	0	0
	14. Accuracy of college information you received before enrolling	0	0	0	0	0	0
	15. College Catalog/admissions publications	0	0	0	0	0	0
RULES & REGULATIONS	16. Student voice in college policies	0	0	0	0	0	0
	17. Rules governing student conduct at this college	0	0	0	0	0	0
	18. Residence hall rules and regulations	0	0	0	0	0	0
	19. Academic probation and suspension policies	0	0	0	0	0	0
	20. Purposes for which student activity fees are used	0	0	0	0	0	0
	21. Personal security/safety at this campus	0	0	0	0	0	0

		LEVEL OF SATISFACTION					
		DOES NOT APPLY	VERY SATISFIED	SATISFIED	NEUTRAL	DISSATISFIED	VERY DISSATISFIED
FACILITIES	22. Classroom facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0
	23. Laboratory facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0
	24. Athletic facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0
	25. Study areas	0	0	0	0	0	0
	26. Student union	0	0	0	0	0	0
	27. Campus bookstore	0	0	0	0	0	0
	28. Availability of student housing	0	0	0	0	0	0
	29. General condition of buildings and grounds	0	0	0	0	0	0
REGISTRATION	30. General registration procedures	0	0	0	0	0	0
	31. Availability of the courses you want at times you can take them	0	0	0	0	0	0
	32. Academic calendar for this college	0	0	0	0	0	0
	33. Billing and fee payment procedures	0	0	0	0	0	0
GENERAL	34. Concern for you as an individual	0	0	0	0	0	0
	35. Attitude of college nonteaching staff toward students	0	0	0	0	0	0
	36. Racial harmony at this college	0	0	0	0	0	0
	37. Opportunities for student employment	0	0	0	0	0	0
	38. Opportunities for personal involvement in campus activities	0	0	0	0	0	0
	39. Student government	0	0	0	0	0	0
	40. Religious activities and programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
	41. Campus media (student newspaper, campus radio, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	42. This college in general	0	0	0	0	0	0

DO NOT TEAR OR STAPLE THIS FORM

SECTION IV—ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

If an additional set of multiple-choice questions is included with this form, please use this section to record your responses. Twelve ovals are provided for each question, but few questions require that many choices. Simply ignore the extra ovals. If no additional questions are enclosed, leave this section blank.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	
D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	
E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	
F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	
G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	
H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	
I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	
K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	
L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	

SECTION V—COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

If you wish to make any comments or suggestions concerning this college, please use the lines provided below.

2522

36

37

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

SECTION IV

The following questions are specific to UC Davis. Please answer them on Page 4 of the Student Opinion Survey by marking ✎ the appropriate oval.

Questions 1–10 measure social problems that occur at many colleges. Based on your observations and experience, how much of a problem is each area listed below for UC Davis students?

USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE:

A.	B.	C.	D.
Not a problem	*Minor problem*	*Moderate problem*	*Serious problem*

1. Drug Abuse
2. Alcohol Abuse
3. Sexual Harassment
4. Intolerance: Race
5. Intolerance: Disability
6. Intolerance: Foreign Origin
7. Intolerance: Homosexuality
8. Cheating
9. Sexually Transmitted Diseases
10. Assaults on Students

11. Which ONE problem area needs immediate campus attention?
    - A. None of these areas
    - B. Drug Abuse
    - C. Alcohol Abuse
    - D. Sexual Harassment
    - E. Intolerance: Race
    - F. Intolerance: Disability
    - G. Intolerance: Foreign Origin
    - H. Intolerance: Homosexuality
    - I. Cheating
    - J. Sexually Transmitted Diseases
    - K. Assaults on Students

Questions 12–29 evaluate academic advising. These questions refer only to advising programs offered in your college or academic department, not to units that offer personal counseling or career advising.

Indicate your level of satisfaction with the types of academic advising listed in Questions 12-16. If you have not used a particular service, mark A.

12. Faculty Advising (within your major)
    - A. I have not used this service.

    I have used this service and I am:
    - B. Very Satisfied
    - C. Satisfied
    - D. Neutral
    - E. Dissatisfied
    - F. Very Dissatisfied

13. Staff Advising (within college or department)
    - A. I have not used this service.

    I have used this service and I am:
    - B. Very Satisfied
    - C. Satisfied
    - D. Neutral
    - E. Dissatisfied
    - F. Very Dissatisfied

14. Departmental Peer Advising
    - A. I have not used this service.

    I have used this service and I am:
    - B. Very Satisfied
    - C. Satisfied
    - D. Neutral
    - E. Dissatisfied
    - F. Very Dissatisfied

15. College Dean's Office
    - A. I have not used this service.

    I have used this service and I am:
    - B. Very Satisfied
    - C. Satisfied
    - D. Neutral
    - E. Dissatisfied
    - F. Very Dissatisfied

16. Exploratory *or* Academic Options Advising
    - A. I have not used this service.

    I have used this service and I am:
    - B. Very Satisfied
    - C. Satisfied
    - D. Neutral
    - E. Dissatisfied
    - F. Very Dissatisfied

17. Which ONE of the following provides your primary source of academic advice?
    - A. Faculty Advisor
    - B. Staff Advisor
    - C. Academic Peer Advisor (department)
    - D. Dean's Office
    - E. Exploratory Program Advisor *or* Academic Options Advisor
    - F. Other

18. Since the beginning of Fall Quarter 1989, how often have you met with your primary academic advisor?
    - A. Never
    - B. Once
    - C. Twice
    - D. Three Times
    - E. Four or Five Times
    - F. More than Five Times

PLEASE CONTINUE ON REVERSE SIDE

Questions 19–24 ask about your *primary source* of academic advice (identified in Question 17). Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement about this advisor. *If you have not met with your advisor since the beginning of Fall Quarter 1989,* **skip to Question 25.** ☛ ☛ ☛ ☛

My Advisor:

19. Is available when I need assistance.
    A. Strongly Agree
    B. Agree
    C. Neutral
    D. Disagree
    E. Strongly Disagree

20. Provides me with accurate information about requirements, prerequisites, etc.
    A. Strongly Agree
    B. Agree
    C. Neutral
    D. Disagree
    E. Strongly Disagree

21. Helps me identify the steps I need to take to reach my educational goals.
    A. Strongly Agree
    B. Agree
    C. Neutral
    D. Disagree
    E. Strongly Disagree

22. Is on time for appointments with me.
    A. Strongly Agree
    B. Agree
    C. Neutral
    D. Disagree
    E. Strongly Disagree

23. Allows sufficient time to discuss issues or problems.
    A. Strongly Agree
    B. Agree
    C. Neutral
    D. Disagree
    E. Strongly Disagree

24. Is a helpful, effective advisor whom I would recommend to other students.
    A. Strongly Agree
    B. Agree
    C. Neutral
    D. Disagree
    E. Strongly Disagree

25. How well do you understand your Academic Major requirements?
    A. Very Well
    B. More than Adequately
    C. Adequately
    D. Less than Adequately
    E. Very Poorly

26. How well do you understand your General Education (GE) requirements?
    A. Very Well
    B. More than Adequately
    C. Adequately
    D. Less than Adequately
    E. Very Poorly

27. How well developed are your academic goals at UC Davis?
    A. Very Well
    B. More than Adequately
    C. Adequately
    D. Less than Adequately
    E. Very Poorly

28. How well developed are your postgraduate career goals?
    A. Very Well
    B. More than Adequately
    C. Adequately
    D. Less than Adequately
    E. Very Poorly

29. Overall, how well does the academic advising system offered at UC Davis meet your needs?
    A. Very Well
    B. More than Adequately
    C. Adequately
    D. Less than Adequately
    E. Very Poorly

◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆

30. Based on your experiences so far, would you still choose to attend UC Davis if you could start over again?
    A. Definitely Yes
    B. Probably Yes
    C. Not Sure
    D. Probably Not
    E. Definitely Not

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS
SECTION V

Please use Section V of the Student Opinion Survey to comment on the strengths and weaknesses of your academic advising experience at UC Davis.

Appendix B

Tables

Library Facilities and Services B-1
Tutorial Services at UC Davis B-2
Computer Services B-3
Testing and Grading B-4
Course Content in the Major B-5
Instruction in the Major B-6
Out-Of-Class Availability of Instructors B-7
Attitude of Faculty toward Students B-8
Variety of Courses Offered at UC Davis B-9
Class Size Relative to Type of Course B-10
Flexibility to Design a Program B-11
Preparation for Future Occupation B-12
Academic Probation Policies B-13
Classroom Facilities B-14
Laboratory Facilities B-15
Study Areas B-16
General Registration Procedures B-17
Availability of Courses B-18
Academic Calendar B-19
UC Davis in General B-20
Cheating B-21
Return to UC Davis? B-22

(The Library Facilities and Services table is included here as a representative sample of all the tables. A complete set, including those listed above in italics, are available by request to Student Affairs Research & Information.)

LIBRARY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	n	mean	sd
1990 NORMS	2.0%	7.0%	10.7%	51.2%	29.0%	27014	3.98	.93
1990 UC Davis	.6	5.4	8.1	55.8	30.1	926	4.09	.80
SEX								
Male	1.3	4.6	8.9	51.3	34.0	432	4.12	.85
Female	.1	6.1	7.4	59.7	26.7	493	4.07	.77
ETHNICITY								
Black	1.2	4.3	10.6	57.1	26.8	254	4.04	.81
Chicano	.7	4.1	10.3	49.0	36.0	292	4.15	.82
Asian		4.0	12.1	54.0	29.8	124	4.10	.76
White/Other	.8	5.9	6.7	56.7	29.9	254	4.09	.82
LEVEL								
Freshman	.1	7.4	10.6	47.4	34.5	212	4.09	.87
Sophomore	1.3	3.8	7.1	54.6	33.3	240	4.15	.81
Junior	.1	6.8	10.4	59.6	23.1	262	3.99	.79
Senior	1.2	3.4	3.9	61.0	30.5	211	4.16	.75
COLLEGE								
A&ES	1.1	6.8	9.5	48.1	34.6	244	4.08	.90
Engineering	.2	1.6	5.6	56.7	36.0	101	4.27	.65
L&S	.5	5.4	8.0	58.9	27.2	581	4.07	.78
1987 NORMS	2.3	7.8	10.8	49.8	29.2	12576	3.96	.96
1987 UC Davis	.3	6.2	9.9	50.6	33.0	476	4.10	.83
SEX								
Male	.6	3.7	8.7	54.7	32.4	220	4.14	.77
Female		8.3	10.9	47.1	33.6	256	4.06	.88
ETHNICITY								
Black		3.0	9.0	56.7	31.3	67	4.16	.71
Chicano		4.1	9.6	43.8	42.5	73	4.25	.80
Asian		2.0	12.2	55.1	30.6	49	4.14	.71
White/Other	.3	7.3	9.4	49.7	33.2	286	4.08	.86
LEVEL								
Freshman		4.9	12.2	44.0	38.9	104	4.17	.83
Sophomore		4.3	6.2	47.5	42.0	95	4.27	.76
Junior		5.3	11.9	54.7	28.1	133	4.06	.78
Senior	.9	9.3	8.7	53.6	27.5	143	3.98	.90
COLLEGE								
A&ES	.4	8.0	9.2	49.8	32.6	287	4.06	.88
Engineering		5.1	13.4	48.4	33.1	129	4.09	.82
L&S			5.6	59.2	35.2	60	4.30	.57

Except for NORMS and ETHNICITY, these tables use weighted values.